DRAFT: DWeb Principles

PURPOSE

These principles define the values of a decentralized web based on enabling agency of all peoples, and carrying the values of transparency, respect and ethics. It is the basis for behavioral norms and mutual accountability for the new web's participants.

These principles originate from members of the DWeb Community — those involved with and convened by the Internet Archive's work on the decentralized web. These stand alongside other sets of principles that share or expand upon these values, in recognition that our effort to build a more just and equitable world are interdependent.

PRINCIPLES

1. Technology for Human Agency

I. We buildstand for technology that enables sovereignty among people and communities, as opposed to enabling external, political forces or optimizing only for financial outcomes.
II. We stand for coexistence, interoperability and discourage walled gardens, to resist user or partner lock-in or centralization of control.
III. We advocate use of open source code.
IV. The ideal of data as a commons is important, as is the central value of preserving the privacy of information about people.
V. We aim for peer-to-peer relationships, rather than hierarchical control and power imbalance.
VI. We encourage organizational methods that assure trust in and among users.
VII. We value tools that suit specific needs and conditions, for people and organizations to develop, modify, and use.
VIII. Our algorithms must minimize surveillance of user behaviors, avoid manipulation of attention and optimize for social benefits.
IX. We believe that multiple technical means can be used to achieve ethical and people-centric outcomes.
X. DWeb is not a forum for promoting or selecting technical approaches.
    A. Architectures: Outcomes should be independent of location
    B. Modularity something?

2. Respectful

I. We support and encourage clear Codes of Conduct to ensure contributors and users abide by a standard guideline of respectful behavior while contributing to projects and attending events.

II. We ask participants to remain mindful of, and take responsibility for, their speech and behavior, including: acting out of respect for others; actively listening to others; and not dominating discussions and respecting physical and emotional boundaries.

3. Distributed benefits

I. High concentration of benefits, including monetary benefits, is antithetical to the decentralized web.

II. We believe that distributed technologies will be most beneficial to society when the rewards and recognition of their success, monetary or otherwise, are distributed among those who contributed to that success. If that is infeasible, commensurate benefit should flow to the community at large.

4. Transparent

I. We stand for open and transparent organizational practices, motivations, and governance, in a manner that ensures equity, mutual trust, and respect.

5. Human Rights

I. The objective of building a distributed web is to protect human rights and empower people, especially those that experience systemic inequity and prejudice.

II. We stand for people having full agency over their own data and relationships, rights to free expression, privacy, and knowledge, as these are essential to human empowerment and dignity.

III. We explicitly condemn the use of distributed tools for harmful purposes such as human trafficking; sexual, mental, or physical abuse; arms trading, and other activities antithetical to human rights.

IV. We encourage building with harm-reduction in mind, and support the adoption of mechanisms that mitigate the potential for abuse.

6. Ecological Awareness

I. We believe technologies that achieve decentralization through tradeoffs such as increased device storage and energy requirements should aim to decrease their ecological impact.

II. We value systems that work towards reducing energy consumption and device resource requirements, while increasing device lifespan.

Last modified: 15th December, 2020

General comments:

- Dawn: This could be a lot BOLDER. Spice it up.
- Gerben: Where do we want to go with this? Just describe how people feel currently, or to shape the DWeb community?

- Ben Lau: You need boundaries - every layer needs to recognize equitable boundaries
- Brewster: These seem to not dweb specific. I tried originally for “A Web that Reliable, Private, and Fun” and have added something along the line of “support publishers with other ways than advertizing” and “a game with many winners.” I think of rms’s 4 freedoms: https://openedreader.org/chapter/stallmans-four-freedom/

  A Web with many winners: no lock in, y, z, transparent, welcoming to new entrants
  A Web that is Private: respectful, trustable, human rights
  A Web that is Reliable: trust, backed up, redundant, off-grid capable
  A Web that is Fun: allows changes, educates, and engages ease of use
  Business Models beyond advertising:
  A web that works for everyone: ease of use and accessibility
  A web without gatekeepers: open protocols, hardware agnostic, community centric

Other Principles

- Governing the Commons, Economic Governance Principles by Elinor Ostrom
- PLAN Technology Design Principles <- infrastructure technology focused principles
- Design Justice Principles
- Feminist Principles of the Internet
- Decentralization Off The Shelf
- UN Declaration of Human Rights
- Shared Digital Europe
- Center for Humane Technology
- Glimmers Report
- https://www.manifestno.com/
- CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance
- “Principles to Guide our Work.” Detroit Digital Justice Coalition
- Nuremberg Principles

Brandon Wallace:
Define decentralization: layers of decentralization
Define audience / community: All internet using people
Define boundaries and exclusions:
Beyond Mere Decentralization, The Orthogonal Web
Short and memorable core values: Integrity, Service, Excellence

Ostrom’s Design = 8 Design Principles for Managing a Commons (the internet as a commons)

-
- 1. The group and resources being managed have clearly defined users and boundaries
- DEFINE BOUNDARIES: There are clearly defined boundaries of a system / resources from the larger environment.
- DEFINE LEGITIMATE USERS / BOUNDARIES: There is a clearly defined community of legitimate users or members
-

- 2. Ensure to match rules governing the use of common resources to the local needs and environmental conditions
- SHARE KNOWLEDGE: All parties share knowledge of local conditions of the system
- ADAPT LOCALLY: Rules are adapted to the local needs and conditions of the community, resources, and environment
-
- 3. DECIDE INCLUSIVELY: Ensure that those affected by the rules can participate in decision making.
-
- 4. GOVERN LOCALLY: Ensure community self-determination (rule making right) is recognized by outside authorities.
- - Consider how local, county, state, national, international jurisdictions impact your community
-
- 5. MONITOR EFFECTIVELY: monitors of the rules and resources are accurate and accountable
-
- 6. HOLD USERS ACCOUNTABLE: Use graduated sanctions for rule violators and free riders, avoid excessive or disproportional sanctions
-
- 7. OFFER MEDIATION: Provide accessible, easy, and low-cost means for conflict resolution.
-
- 8. DON'T EXTERNALIZE COSTS: Build responsibility for governing the common resource in nested tiers from the lowest level up to the entire interconnected system

FROM IRYNA: Copenhagen Letter
https://copenhagenletter.org/

- Would like more pizzazz and inspirational headings
- More memorable

ANDI:
This document seems to address three functions, all mixed together (how to behave, how to build technology)

JOACHIM:

- Likes turning the headers into easy remember, light hearted
- But wants to uphold the value of the details here
- 10 years from now, how will we explain how we got to where we are to someone new? Having something like this will be valuable

JAY: 10 Year Vision

- The DWeb has defeated censorship

ANDI:

- You have to be a gardener; you have to tend to those seed
- In 10 years, your target audience is today's now 10-year-old
- Right now today's 10 year old is mandated to use tools like Zoom & Google
- Goal is to trust in their instincts, trust in collaboration, where would you invest time to create those places?

JOACHIM: 10 years from now

- Maybe the language of these principles might change
- Reflecting what we have achieved
- That principles change, reflecting movement and growth

IRYNA:

- In 10 years, they will be more timeless (eg-- 50 years ago, the Ecological imperative, the privacy imperative would not be on the list)
- In 10 years, businesses will need to adjust to shape their ethics to our vision

BRANDON: